

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/286,249	04/05/1999	BRUCE W. STELMAN	HELLO-00308	4721
28960	7590 03/10/2004		EXAMINER	
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP 162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD			HAROLD, JEFFEREY F	
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2644	/7
		•	DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Analization No.	Applicant(c)			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	09/286,249	STELMAN, BRUCE W.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this commission of	Jefferey F. Harold	2644			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) or will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for ute, cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 December 2003</u> .  2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 41-58 and 63 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 41-58 and 63 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)	ο Π. I				
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 08) 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/286,249

Art Unit: 2644

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 41-58 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 41-58 and 63 of this application is asserted by applicant to correspond to claim(s) of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,603.

The examiner does not consider this claim to be directed to the same invention as that of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,603 because the support for the copied claims is not the same as that of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,603. Accordingly, an interference cannot be initiated based upon this claim. The specific differences are discussed below.

Regarding claim 41, the claim limitation recites "...a switch matrix, settable to any of a plurality of switch configurations...". U.S. Patent No. 5,729,603 discloses that the plurality of switch configuration is specifically 6 configurations as disclosed at column 4, line 32 through column 5, line 24 and exhibited in table. Conversely applicant's specification does not disclose the number of possible configuration, thus the support for the claimed limitation is different. The claim further cites limitation"...a control logic, coupled to the switch matrix, that automatically determines which of the

Application/Control Number: 09/286,249

Art Unit: 2644

plurality of signal lines from the handset port comprise the handset port receive path, determines a preferred switch configuration from among a plurality of switch configurations based upon which of the plurality of signal lines from the handset port comprise the handset port receive path, and sets the switch matrix to the preferred switch configuration, the preferred switch configuration coupling the handset port receive path to the headset receive path." U.S. Patent No. 5,729,603 discloses that control logic test each of the six configurations is tested with a test signal, typically a dial tone and the result is measured via the signal level detector to determine the preferred configuration. Each of the six combinations are tested sequentially and the result is compared to the previous result and the best result is used as the combination. Conversely the applicant's specification does not disclose the above process to determine the appropriate configuration. Therefore claim 41 fails to meet the requirement of MPEP 2307.02

Regarding **claim 56, 57 and 63**, disclose the same limitations as in claim 41, thus the applicant specification fail to provide the support to copy the claim limitation as stated above. Therefore claim 41 fails to meet the requirement of MPEP 2307.02.

### Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed December 12, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, applicant's arguments regarding written description requirements, the examiner respectfully disagrees. MPEP 2163: The "written description" question similarly arises in the interference context, where the issue is whether the specification of one party to the interference can support the newly added

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/286,249

Art Unit: 2644

claims corresponding to the count at issue, i.e., whether that party can "make the claim" corresponding to the interference count. See, e.g., Martin v. Mayer, 823 F.2d 500, 503, 3 USPQ2d 1333, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Based on the above cited rejection the examiner discusses the bases for the disclosure not supporting the copied claims. Further, MPEP 2163.03: IV. SUPPORT FOR A CLAIM CORRESPONDING TO A COUNT IN AN INTERFERENCE; In an interference proceeding, the claim corresponding to a count must be supported by the specification in the manner provided by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Fields v. Conover, 443 F.2d 1386, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971) (A broad generic disclosure to a class of compounds was not a sufficient written description of a specific compound within the class.). Furthermore, when a party to an interference seeks the benefit of an earlier-filed U.S. patent application, the earlier application must meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for the subject matter of the count. Hyatt v. Boone, 146 F.3d 1348, 1352, 47 USPQ2d 1128, 1130 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Therefore, the examiner does not consider this claim to be directed to the same invention.

#### Conclusion

3. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2644

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jefferey F. Harold whose telephone number is (703) 306-5836. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JFH

March 5, 2004

MINSUN CH HATYTY PRIMARY